

What we see on television, when we see the pictures of these enormous forest fires, is the canopies of the big trees literally superheating and then exploding into flame, and this is what spreads the fire for miles and miles.

If the dead and dying fuel on the forest floor is removed, the down fuel as well as those small-diameter trees that are literally choking the forests to death right now, it is not only opened up for the trees and other flora and fauna that we want to grow properly but it also removes a significant fire danger. That is what the scientific community understands needs to be done.

The problem is that there are radical environmentalists who do not want to see this done. Ironically, our goal is the same: To protect those beautiful big trees and to create a healthy environment for all of the other flora and fauna. But they are so afraid that a timber industry will be either preserved or regenerated, and that that timber industry will soon set its sights on cutting the big trees as well, that they are really willing to cut off their nose to spite their face; that is to say, to risk the health of the entire forest in order that a timber industry is not encouraged to take hold.

In my State of Arizona, there is not any more timber industry, so we are not interested in bringing an industry back. It is gone. There are a couple of small mills that can take small-diameter timber and make 2 by 4's and fiberboard. The White Mountain Apache Indian Tribe has two small mills that can handle larger diameter timber which they cut on their reservation.

But this is not about creating a timber industry in Arizona. It is not about logging. We are not going to have logging as we used to know it. It is about companies being permitted to do the Government's work of cleaning out the forests and making a little bit of profit. They are not going to do it for free. We do not have enough money in the budget to pay the cost of doing that. They have to be willing to do it for the small amount of money they can make on the products they are now permitted to sell.

That is what this debate has been all about, and I am very discouraged that the radical environmental movement has such a stranglehold on some politicians that even though they will privately tell us they understand the scientists are right, that we do need to go in and manage our forests, they are not willing to confront these people in an open forum. It has been an interesting one-sided debate we have had in the Senate. No one has defended the other position. The reason is because it is indefensible. It boils down to a political issue. That is too bad for the forests.

I understand what happens when we are not able to reach agreement. We are not going to be able to get 60 votes to carry the day. As a result, we have to find another way to do this. Therefore, depending upon what the assist-

ant majority leader and others decide to do at the end of the day, that issue may well be behind us as of tonight as something we will deal with in the Senate. That is too bad. We should have been able to deal with that.

I add a postscript before I turn to the next subject. Some on my side of the aisle have criticized the majority leader because he was able to secure in an appropriations bill special relief for his home State of South Dakota and the Black Hills by doing exactly what we are talking about, thinning those forests. He did that by, in effect, waiving all environmental considerations. In other words, the legislation provided the sufficiency for environmental achievement and nothing further was required to clean up these forests.

There was criticism. I suppose one could criticize the use of the process in the way that he did but frankly, I cannot criticize what he was attempting to achieve and what will be achieved as a result of his actions. The Black Hills are some of my favorite forests in this country. I used to vacation there as a young boy. I love the Black Hills. I am glad the majority leader saw fit to save the Black Hills. I wish we could apply something close to that same management technique for the rest of the country's forests. I find it ironic people would permit it to be done in this one area, which I support, but nowhere else.

I hope we can find a way to address this in the future, put the politics behind us, and get back to a scientific resolution of the issue.

#### IRAQ

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the second subject I address is a resolution the White House has sent Congress for consideration of Presidential authority to deal with the problem of Iraq. There have been questions raised this weekend about the language of the resolution and the need, in some people's minds, to define it and provide greater definition.

My own view is the President and his administration did a very good job at crafting a resolution which will give the President the authority he needs to do the things we understand have to be done. I am a little worried about trying to be too cute in drafting language that will constrain the President in a variety of ways, not because we do not want to know what the President has in mind, but because we do not want to come back to the Congress every time the President needs some additional component of authority in fighting this war on terror.

The immediate need is to grant the authority to follow up on the resolutions that were violated by Saddam Hussein, and that if the United Nations is not going to take action, and it is not, then for the United States to be able to do that. We will pass that resolution by a fairly wide margin both in the House of Representatives and in

the Senate. I am hoping Members of this body will not view it necessary to draft the language in such a way that it puts the interests of the United States behind the authority of the United Nations.

The U.S. Government and those who represent the people of America will act on behalf of the security interests of the American people. That ought to be our first objective, not to try to resurrect the good reputation of the United Nations, not to put the U.S. position in a subservient role to the Security Council of the United Nations, and not to subject our decisionmaking or the President's authority to act to approval first of a body in the United Nations.

I therefore urge my colleagues not to succumb to the temptation of inserting language which would submit first to the United Nations and then the U.S. Congress.

It was my understanding—perhaps I should have asked unanimous consent before I began to speak—that I would be allotted 20 minutes, 10 minutes beyond the usual time.

Mr. REID. We have a limited amount of time. We have Democrats that need to speak.

I am sorry, but I have to object.

Mr. KYL. Might I then have 30 seconds to explain that I had been told that I would have 20 minutes, and I have calibrated my remarks to reflect that? I regret I will not be able to finish these remarks.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator. We on this side have speakers who wish to speak. If the entire allotted time is not used—I think it will be; we have our time allotted—perhaps the Senator wants to wait around to see if Democrats show up when they are supposed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair observes that the minority controls 8 minute 16 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask that the Senator from New Mexico be allocated the 8 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may proceed.

#### THE ECONOMY

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, fellow Senators, I will not get a chance today to accomplish what I intend to accomplish. I assure those who are listening they will not have to wait long to get the rest of it because as we get time this week, we will start talking a little bit.

The majority side, led by the majority leader and the chairman of the Budget Committee, last week took to the floor one or two times with lengthy discussions about the American economy, with comments by each of them about who was to blame for the economic shortcomings that exist today.

I start with the economic downturn. Many Members and a few Americans remember the name Joseph Stiglitz. He was chairman of President Clinton's